

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the examiner for the courtesy extended to the undersigned representative during the telephone interview over several days ending on March 10, 2010. During the interview, which was initiated by the undersigned, the examiner acknowledged that the proposed amendments presented in the reply filed February 9, 2010 should have been entered, but indicated that he was of the opinion that the amendments would not overcome the rejections over the prior art. During the interview there was also discussion of additional amendments, to clarify in claim 22 that the elongate body extends above the item to be cleaned and engages the item to be cleaned from above. Claim 22, as set forth above, incorporates the amendments that were discussed. The examiner indicated that these amendments would remove the rejection of claim 22 under 35 USC 102 over Bruhin.

There was also discussion during the interview of the possibility of adding a combination claim, directed to the combination of the portable cleaning assembly and the item to be cleaned. The examiner indicated that he would not consider the claim to the combination to be drawn to a different invention from the claim to the sub-combination, such as to require restriction. Claim 43 set forth above is directed to the combination.

Respectfully submitted,

/John Smith-Hill/
John Smith-Hill
Reg. No. 27,730

Chernoff, Vilhauer, McClung & Stenzel, LLP
601 SW Second Ave. Ste. 1600
Portland, OR 97204

Tel. (503) 278-3334
Fax (503) 228-4373

Docket: SWIN.3523